

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 6, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25 and 26 were pending and rejected claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25 and 26. Claims 3, 9, 16, 20, 25 and 26 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, new claims 27 and 28 have been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 25-28 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are respectfully traversed below.

Objection to the Claims

The Office Action, on page 3, objected to claims 3, 9, 16, 20, 25 and 26 because of informalities. Claims 3, 9, 16, 20, 25, and 26 have been amended to overcome the objection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action, on page 4, rejected claims 3-5, 9-11, 16, 17, 20-22, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivula (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,711) in view of Adachi (U.S. Patent No. 6,829,474).

Sivula is related to adapting messaging content between different types of mobile terminal stations with minimal need for signaling (see column 1 lines 7-10, of Sivula). According to Sivula, an originating mobile station 10 sends a special content message on a signal line 12 to a special application service center 14, which is able to process the special content message and posts it on the internet (see column 5 line 66 to column 6 lines 5, of Sivula).

However, it is submitted that claim 3, as amended, is patentable over Sivula, as Sivula fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least the features of

a processor receiving a content transmission request including a content identification of a content for broadband transfer ... and an address of a receiving device, determined by said user, which is to receive data of said content, from a separate device which is different from said receiving device and receives and displays a content for narrowband transfer, over said mobile communication network not via said receiving device;

in response to the receipt of said content identification and said received address of said receiving device ... said processor transmit[s] through the gateway, over said broadband network, said received content identification and said received address of said receiving device to a content data providing information processing apparatus which provides said content data ... automatically [to said receiving device over said broadband network], in response to the receipt ... of said transmitted content identification and said transmitted address of said receiving device

as recited in claim 1.

According to Sivula, the special application service center first sends a message to the terminating mobile station to determine if the terminating mobile station is capable of receiving the special content message (see column 8 lines 8-14, of Sivula). If the terminating mobile station is capable of receiving the special content message, the terminating mobile station will send a request back to the special application service center. Once the request is received at the special application service center, the special message is transmitted to the terminal mobile station (see column 8 lines 52-56, of Sivula).

However, in claim 3, “a processor receiv[es] a content transmission request including a content identification of a content for broadband transfer ... and an address of a receiving device ... from a separate device” and “in response to the receipt ... said processor transmit[s] through the gateway ... said received content identification and said received address of said receiving device to a content data providing information processing apparatus which provides said content data ... automatically [to said receiving device over said broadband network], in response to the receipt ... of said transmitted content identification and said transmitted address of said receiving device”.

Sivula fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least the features, as quoted above, because Sivula describes that a *message* must be transmitted to the terminating mobile station to determine if the terminating mobile station is capable of receiving the special content message, rather than providing the *content data* to the receiving device in response to the receipt, at the processing apparatus, of the transmitted content identification and the transmitted address of the receiving device from the processor.

Adachi also fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, at least the features of claim 3, as quoted above, because Adachi is merely concerned with allowing a user to easily obtain desired value-added services by using a gateway server to provide a unified interface to the terminal such that the terminal is allowed to gain access to any of the value-added service servers under a single interface condition (see Abstract of Adachi).

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 3 is patentable over Sivula and Adachi, taken alone or in combination.

Independent claims 9, 16 and 20 recite features similar to those in claim 3. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 9, 16 and 20 are patentable over Sivula and Adachi, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 3.

Claim 25 recites “receiving on a information server via mobile communications network a request from a mobile device ... and transmitting from the information server via a gateway to a

content server on a broadband network ... the request ..., the content server transmitting automatically to the receiving device separate from the mobile device the contents addressed by the uniform resource locator". Therefore, it is submitted that claim 26 is patentable over Sivula and Adachi, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 3.

Claim 26 recites "receiving content data at a network server via a mobile communications network from a device ... [and] transmitting said content data including the content identification and the address of the receiving device to a content server ... and transmitting the content to the receiving device automatically by the content server". Therefore, it is submitted that claim 26 is patentable over Sivula and Adachi, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 3.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claim 27, which has been added, is supported at page 8, lines 27-30, page 9, lines 21-25, and page 10, lines 6-9 and Fig. 4B of the application. It is submitted that claim 27 is patentable over the cited references, as neither reference, taken alone or in combination discloses, either expressly or implicitly, the feature of "a processor that includes a receiving portion that receives a content transmission request including a content identification of a content for broadband transfer ... and an address of a receiving device, determined by said user ... from a separate device ...; [and] a content determining portion that determines content data specified with the content identification; and a content transmission portion that transmits the determined content data to the receiving device specified with the address over the broadband network" as recited in claim 27.

New claim 28, which has been added, is supported at page 9, lines 21-34 and page 9, line 35 to page 10, line 9 and Figure 4B of the application. It is submitted that claim 27 is patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as base claim 28, from which it depends, and is further patentable over the cited references for reasons discussed below.

According to Sivula, the short message sent to the terminating mobile station includes a unique password generated by the special application service center (see column 6 lines 47-50, of Sivula). According to Sivula, if the terminating mobile station is not capable of processing the special content message, the user can go to the nearest personal computer connected to the

internet and view the special content message at the URL by entering a user ID and password provided in the short message (see column 7 lines 18-25, of Sivula).

Therefore, it is submitted that Sivula fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the feature of "transmit[ting] an authentication request to the receiving device specified with the address, with the authentication information to determine whether the authentication information is correct" as recited in claim 28.

Further, nothing was found in Adachi that cures the above mentioned deficiencies of Sivula as discussed above.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 28 is patentable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 5, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/

Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501